



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,450	09/26/2006	Peter Franz Beck	W1.2379 PCT-US	5534
7590	07/20/2007		EXAMINER [REDACTED]	
Douglas R Hanscom Jones Tullar & Cooper PO Box 2266 Eads Station Arlington, VA 22202			DESAI, HEMANT	
			ART UNIT [REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER 3721
			MAIL DATE 07/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/594,450	BECK ET AL.	
	Examiner Hemant M. Desai	Art Unit 3721	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 55-104 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 55-104 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/26/06</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 55-56, 78-92 and 93-100 and 103-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ruckmann et al. (6821240).

Ruckmann et al. disclose a web draw-in device comprising a superstructure, at least one former (18), a transverse cutting device (see col. 14, lines 29-33; col. 15, lines 5-10), the superstructure and the transverse cutting device adapted to separate webs of material (05, 06, 07, 08) transported in the superstructure and folded at the former, the transverse cutting device being located after the former, and at least one guide rail (80, 88, 89, 94, 96) adapted to receive a paper web leading end holding device (fig. 11) and usable to guide the web of material through the superstructure along a route of travel of the web of material in the web folding apparatus, the guide rail extending from the superstructure into the former and past, in the direction of web travel, the transverse cutting device (figs. 1-2), which meets all the claimed limitations.

Regarding claims 73-76, 85, 103-104 Ruckmann et al. discloses a storage device and separating device to separate the web-leading end from the holding device (see col. 4, lines 51-58).

Regarding claims 82-84, Ruckmann et al. disclose a glue preparation device (col. 15, lines 60-65).

Regarding claims 97-100, Ruckmann et al., as mentioned above, meets all the claimed limitations of method claims 97-100.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 57-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruckmann et al. (6821240) in view of Hauck et al. (6269751).

Ruckmann et al. as mentioned above, disclose the guide rail. Ruckmann et al. do not discloses that the guide rails is displaceable and can have articulated sections. However, Hauck et al. disclose that it is well known in the art to provide displaceable guide rails (see figs. 1 and 3) for having articulated section for drawing in webs of material into web-fed rotary printing press (see col. 1, lines 45-50). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide displaceable guide rails as taught by Hauck et al. in the web draw-in device of Ruckmann et al. to draw-in the web through different parts of folding device.

Regarding claim 64, Ruckmann et al. disclose that the guide rail includes a bottom and spaced sidewalls defining a groove (see fig. 12) in which the holding device is guided.

5. Claims 65-72, 101-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruckmann et al. (6821240) in view of Muth et al. (3544454).

Ruckmann et al. as mentioned above, disclose the transverse cutting device (see col. 14, lines 29-33; col. 15, lines 5-10). Ruckmann et al. do not disclose the structure and clipping device. However, Muth et al. teach a transverse cutting device with two pairs of cutting cylinders, wherein the transverse cutting device has a cutter cylinder, a folding blade cylinder and spur needles (213) designed as a holding system. The first transverse cutting device (202) can transversely cut off a portion of the paper web, which is skewered by the spur needles and is conducted into the waste container 215. Thus, in addition to the first transverse cutting device 203, the device contains a second transverse cutting device 202, which can also be considered to be a clipping device. This clipping device 202 is also capable of meeting the functional characteristic, namely of cutting white paper waste at the front off the webs of material. The inlet of the transverse cutting device 203 is arranged in the extension of the passage direction of the webs of material through the clipping device 202, wherein the transverse cutting device is arranged vertically underneath the clipping device. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the structure of transverse cutting devise of Ruckmann et al. as the structure as taught by Muth et al. and the clipping device to cut white paper waste at the front off the webs.

6. Claims 77 and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruckmann et al. (6821240) in view of Stein et al. (5699735).

Ruckmann et al., as mentioned above, disclose all the claimed limitations, except for a roll changer. However, Stein et al. teach a roll changer (13, fig. 2) for accommodate the printing material web of different widths (see col. 1, lines 30-33). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the roll changer as taught by Stein et al. in the web draw-in device of Ruckmann et al. for accommodate the printing material web of different widths.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hemant M. Desai whose telephone number is (571) 272-4458. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM-5:00 PM, Mon-Thurs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached on (571) 272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Art Unit: 3721

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hemant M. Desai

Hemant M Desai
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3721

/hd/